

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL
RESOURCES

Mr. President, I would like to announce for the public that a hearing has been scheduled before the full Committee on Energy and Natural Resources to consider S. 638, the Insular Development Act of 1995.

The hearing will take place Thursday, May 25, 1995, at 2 p.m., in room SD-366 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building in Washington, DC.

Those wishing to testify or who wish to submit written statements should write to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC 20510. For further information, please call Jim Beirne at (202) 224-2564 or Betty Nevitt at 202-224-0765.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

BUDGET SCOREKEEPING REPORT

• Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I hereby submit to the Senate the budget scorekeeping report prepared by the Congressional Budget Office under section 308(b) and in aid of section 311 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, as amended. This report meets the requirements for Senate scorekeeping of section 5 of Senate Concurrent Resolution 32, the first concurrent resolution on the budget for 1986.

This report shows the effects of congressional action on the budget through May 5, 1995. The estimates of budget authority, outlays, and revenues, which are consistent with the technical and economic assumptions of the concurrent resolution on the budget (H. Con. Res. 218), show that current level spending is below the budget resolution by \$5.6 billion in budget authority and \$1.4 billion in outlays. Current level is \$0.5 billion over the revenue floor in 1995 and below by \$9.5 billion over the 5 years 1995-99. The current estimate of the deficit for purposes of calculating the maximum deficit amount is \$238 billion, \$3.1 billion below the maximum deficit amount for 1995 of \$241 billion.

Since my last report, dated April 24, 1995, there has been no action that affects the current level of budget authority, outlays, or revenues.

The report follows:

U.S. CONGRESS,
CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE,
Washington, DC, May 8, 1995.

Hon. PETE DOMENICI,
Chairman, Committee on the Budget, U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The attached report for fiscal year 1995 shows the effects of Congressional action on the 1995 budget and is current through May 5, 1995. The estimates of budget authority, outlays and revenues are consistent with the technical and economic assumptions of the 1995 Concurrent Resolution on the Budget (H. Con. Res. 218). This report is submitted under Section 308(b) and in aid of Section 311 of the Congressional Budget Act, as amended, and meets the requirements of Senate scorekeeping of Section 5 of S. Con. Res. 32, the 1986 First Concurrent Resolution on the Budget.

Since my last report, dated April 24, 1995, there has been no action that affects the current level of budget authority, outlays or revenues.

Sincerely,

JUNE E. O'NEILL,
Director.

THE CURRENT LEVEL REPORT FOR THE U.S. SENATE, FISCAL YEAR 1995, 104TH CONGRESS, 1ST SESSION, AS OF CLOSE OF BUSINESS MAY 5, 1995

[In billions of dollars]

	Budget resolution (H. Con. Res. 218) ¹	Current level ²	Current level over/under resolution
ON-BUDGET			
Budget authority	1,238.7	1,233.1	-5.6
Outlays	1,217.6	1,216.2	-1.4
Revenues:			
1995	977.7	978.2	0.5
1995-99	5,415.2	5,405.7	-9.5
Deficit	241.0	238.0	-3.1
Debt subject to limit	4,965.1	4,764.5	-200.6
OFF-BUDGET			
Social Security outlays:			
1995	287.6	287.5	-0.1
1995-99	1,562.6	1,562.6	0.
Social Security revenues:			
1995	360.5	360.3	-0.2
1995-99	1,998.4	1,998.2	-0.2

¹ Reflects revised allocation under section 9(g) of H. Con. Res. 64 for the Deficit-Neutral reserve fund.

² Current level represents the estimated revenue and direct spending effects of all legislation that Congress has enacted or sent to the President for his approval. In addition, full-year funding estimates under current law are included for entitlement and mandatory programs requiring annual appropriations even if the appropriations have not been made. The current level of debt subject to limit reflects the latest U.S. Treasury information on public debt transactions.

³ Less than \$50 million.

Note: Detail may not add due to rounding.

THE ON-BUDGET CURRENT LEVEL REPORT FOR THE U.S. SENATE, 104TH CONGRESS, 1ST SESSION, SENATE SUPPORTING DETAIL FOR FISCAL YEAR 1995 AS OF CLOSE OF BUSINESS MAY 5, 1995

[In millions of dollars]

	Budget authority	Outlays	Revenues
ENACTED IN PREVIOUS SESSIONS			
Revenues			978,466
Permanents and other spending legislation	750,307	706,236	
Appropriation legislation	738,096	757,783	
Offsetting receipts	(250,027)	(250,027)	
Total previously enacted	1,238,376	1,213,992	978,466
ENACTED THIS SESSION			
1995 Emergency Supplementals and Rescissions Act (Public Law 104-6)	(3,386)	(1,008)	
Self-Employed Health Insurance Act (Public Law 104-7)			(248)
Total enacted this session	(3,386)	(1,008)	(248)
ENTITLEMENTS AND MANDATORIES			
Budget resolution baseline estimates of appropriated entitlements other mandatory programs not yet enacted	(1,887)	3,189	
Total current level ¹	1,233,103	1,216,173	978,218
Total budget resolution	1,238,744	1,217,605	977,700
Amount remaining:			
Under budget resolution	5,641	1,432	
Over budget resolution			518

¹ In accordance with the Budget Enforcement Act, the total does not include \$3,905 million in budget authority and \$7,442 million in outlays in funding for emergencies that have been designated as such by the President and the Congress, and \$841 million in budget authority and \$917 million in outlays for emergencies that would be available only upon an official budget request from the President designating the entire amount requested as an emergency requirement.

Notes: Numbers in parentheses are negative. Detail may not add due to rounding.

TIME FOR REAL FARM REFORM

• Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, no other legislation which is likely to come before the Congress this year will

have more direct impact on my State, North Dakota, and the people who live there than the 1995 farm bill. For a farm State, for a State with a predominantly rural economy, it is critically important legislation.

When Congress and the President begin to draft that legislation, I believe it is essential that we be about the business of fundamental reform. The time for farm program facelifts has long since passed. It is time for real change, change that returns the farm program to its fundamental and original mission: helping family farmers survive and prosper.

I recently wrote a guest editorial which was published in a number of North Dakota newspapers which outlined my thinking on this important issue in some detail. I would like to share that article, and those thoughts, with my colleagues and ask that it be reprinted at this point in the RECORD.

The editorial follows:

NO MORE FACELIFTS FOR THE FARM
PROGRAM—IT'S TIME FOR REAL REFORM
(By U.S. Senator Byron L. Dorgan)

The new U.S. Secretary of Agriculture, Dan Glickman, is coming to North Dakota Friday at my invitation to meet with family farmers. His visit comes at both an opportune and very challenging time.

This year Congress will cut federal spending to reduce the deficit. It will also write a new five year farm program. The two are closely related. Budget pressures will limit the amount of money available for a farm program.

Farm program price supports have already been cut deeply—slashed by 62% since 1986—but still, some leaders in the new Congress are pushing for even deeper cuts. House Majority Leader Dick Armey (R-TX) and Senate Agriculture Committee Chair Richard Lugar (R-IN) are calling outright for the federal farm program to be phased down and, effectively, abolished.

Those of us who believe that a decent farm program is essential to the survival of family farmers face a major challenge. To retain a decent farm program, we are going to have to propose new, and more effective approaches. We must take a fresh look at what works and what doesn't in the farm program.

I hope that will be the focus of the discussion in North Dakota on Friday with the Secretary of Agriculture.

At the outset we have to admit that the current farm program doesn't work very well.

First, price supports are too low to offer real protection to family-sized farms. That's because the nation's largest farms—often big corporate farms—soak up too much of the farm program's funds.

Second, the current farm program is far too complicated.

Third, it is built on a "supply management" approach that no longer works. In the new global market place of the 1990's and beyond, it is virtually impossible for one nation to control supplies. When we cut production of a commodity, other countries eagerly step in and fill the gap.

The bottom line is that the current farm program does not do a good job serving as a safety net for family farmers nor does it do much to boost market prices for farm commodities.

Under the current program, we have ended up with more government employees to run the farm program, and fewer family farmers. That's moving in the wrong direction.

So, this year we need real reform—not another farm program facelift.

A NEW APPROACH

The first thing we must do in re-thinking the federal farm program is to establish a new benchmark for farm legislation, one that focuses on preserving and building a network of family farms which are the backbone of rural America's economy and its communities.

The first sentence in the new 1995 Farm Bill should state, clearly, that the objective of the federal farm program is to help preserve and build a network of family farms. Everything after that must work to make that goal a reality.

If the purpose of the farm program isn't to give family farmers an opportunity to make a living on the farm, then we ought to scrap it. We don't need a farm program that helps giant agri-factories plow the ground.

THE DORGAN PLAN TO STRENGTHEN FAMILY FARMS

I propose a family farm-targeted farm program, which would provide a better price safety net for family farmers.

It would end government interference so that all farmers could make their own production decisions based on the best use of their land resources, the opportunities of the marketplace, and their skills and knowledge as producers.

Here is how it would work:

1. My plan would establish a new Family Farm Target Price at \$4.50 per bushel on wheat (compared to the current target price of \$4.00 per bushel) up to the first 20,000 bushels of production. Proportional target prices and production levels would be set to cover feed grains or a producer's mix of basic farm program commodities.

2. Farmers would be free to make their own decisions about what they produce based on the market situation. Production beyond the amount of grain eligible for target prices, would be up to the farmer, and would not receive farm program benefits.

If someone wants to farm an entire county, they have every right to do that. But under my plan, they, like family-sized farms would get price protection for 20,000 bushels of wheat produced. What they produce above that, they do without any government interference, and without price supports—they assume all the risks of the market place.

3. On those first 20,000 bushels of wheat, the plan would provide non-recourse market-opportunity loans set at out-of-pocket production costs as determined by the Secretary of Agriculture. Crops produced beyond this benchmark level would not be eligible for this loan.

4. It would extend the Conservation Reserve Program (CRP) and make it more flexible to assist producers in meeting stewardship and environmental goals. Savings achieved by making some changes in the CRP program could be used to restore funding for other conservation programs that assist farmers, and to improve farm program support prices.

5. It would limit participation in the farm price support program to those who are actively engaged in farming, and end program payments to off-farm investors. We could use the savings to improve the safety net of price supports for family farmers.

My plan tightly focuses federal farm programs—and dollars—on family farmers. It would put price supports under family farmers, rather than under farm commodities.

It will provide our farm families the opportunity to make a living at efficient levels of production.

It will provide an abundant supply of efficiently produced food and fiber for our nation, and make the best use of limited fed-

eral farm program dollars. It will provide the strongest price support for the first increment of production which will provide the most help for family sized farms.

It will end the practice of providing unnecessary and unlimited price protection to the nation's largest corporate farms, while shortchanging the nation's family farmers.

My farm program proposal would also end the practice of paying price supports to off-farm investors. We would define who is really a farmer and who is farming the system. Under my plan, the farm price safety net would go to actual farm operators (and retired farmers who derive a majority of their income from crop-share arrangements). The safety net would extend only to those who are engaged in the day-to-day running of a farm operation or depend on a farm operation for a majority of their income.

We would repeal and close the loopholes by which some of the biggest landholders and corporations receive multiple farm program entitlements.

We need to get back to the original purpose of agricultural programs: to preserve and protect a network of family farms and help them compete in an unpredictable world in which weather, market conditions, and economic policies constantly undermine their efficiency and their productivity.

My family farm targeted farm program would give family farmers a chance—an opportunity—to preserve a production system and a lifestyle that is important to our country.●

HONORING THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA AT LOS ANGELES BASKETBALL COACH JIM HARRICK

● Mr. ABRAHAM. Mr. President, I rise to pay tribute to a great man and a great head coach; Jim Harrick of the UCLA Bruins.

While everyone may be familiar with Jim's most recent accomplishment, winning the 1995 NCAA Championship, those that have followed his career see a man that has accepted challenge after challenge and built a reputation for success.

Jim attended the University of Charleston where, in addition to receiving his bachelor's degree in speech, he earned a place in the Hall of Fame and Alumni Gallery of Achievement. He then went on to complete his master's degree in education from the University of Southern California.

Jim began his coaching career at Morningside High in Los Angeles, averaging over 25 victories and winning three Sky League titles in four seasons. After distinguishing himself as an assistant coach at Utah State and later UCLA, Jim accepted the head coach position at Pepperdine University. In his nine seasons at Pepperdine, coach Harrick won five conference titles, four WCAC Coach of the Year Awards, and, of course, the invitation to come back to UCLA as the new head coach.

The UCLA basketball program has flourish under Jim's direction. He is the first UCLA coach to have 7 consecutive 20-win seasons and 7 straight tournament bids in his initial 7 seasons. At 146 wins and 54 losses, he also owns the best UCLA record after his first 200 games. Under coach Harrick's

tutelage, the Bruins have advanced to the NCAA tournament's second round five times, the Sweet 16 three times, the Elite Eight twice and, in 1995, earned the crowning achievement as NCAA National Champions.

And it is important to note that Jim Harrick's successes have not all come on the basketball court. He and his wife, Sally, celebrate 34 years of marriage and proudly speak of their three sons, Monte, Jim, and Glenn, and of their granddaughter, Morgan Paige. His integrity and character are well known and have earned him invitations to travel the world as an American goodwill ambassador.

His dedication to the game, his concern with the well-being of the players, his focus and determination, and the integrity of the UCLA program all show his fine qualities as a coach and as an American.●

ORDERS FOR TUESDAY, MAY 9, 1995

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it stand in recess until the hour of 9:15 a.m. on Tuesday, May 9, 1995; that following the prayer, the Journal of proceedings be deemed approved to date, the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day, and there then be a period for the transaction of morning business, not to extend beyond the hour of 10:30 a.m., with Senators permitted to speak for up to 5 minutes each, with the exception of the following: Senator THOMAS, 20 minutes; Senator DASCHLE or his designee, 20 minutes; Senator LEVIN, 20 minutes; Senator SANTORUM, 10 minutes; I further ask unanimous consent that at the hour of 10:30 a.m., the Senate proceed to a vote on the confirmation of the nomination of John Deutch to be Director of CIA, to be immediately followed by a vote on the motion to invoke cloture on the Coverdell-Dole amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent that Senators have until 10:15 a.m. Tuesday to file first-degree and second-degree amendments; further, that the Senate stand in recess between the hours of 12:30 and 2:15 Tuesday for the weekly policy luncheons to meet.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, for the information of all Senators, there will be two consecutive rollcall votes beginning at 10:30 tomorrow morning. The first vote is on the Deutch nomination, to be followed by a vote on the cloture motion on the Coverdell-Dole amendment.